

### Remarks

Claims 1-15 were presented for prosecution. Various objections to the specification, drawings and claims were raised and are addressed below. Claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 14-15 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Tamba (US 5,594,383). Claims 2, 10 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tamba in view of Petersen et al. (US 5,325,317). Claims 8 and 11 were indicated has having allowable subject matter. Applicant greatly appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicant has herein canceled claims 8 and 11 and rewritten the claims in independent from as new claims 16 and 17, respectively. No new matter is believed added.

The specification and drawings were objected to over claim 14. Applicant has herein amended claim 14, and also points the Examiner's attention to Figure 7, and associated text on pages 10 and 11. Applicant submits that the specification, drawing and claim are proper, and therefore requests withdrawal of the objections and rejections under 25 USC 112, second paragraph.

The abstract has been amended to be submitted on a separate sheet in one paragraph. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Various amendments were made to the claims to address objections. Applicant however submits that the language "of claim 1" is proper language for a claim that depends therefrom. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5 and 15 were also amended to address the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections. With regard to claim 10, Applicant submits that the term "threshold voltage" is adequately described in the specification, in that it is well known in the art

how to generate and vary a voltage. Similarly, it is well known how to vary a clock signal. In addition, claim 10 was amended to depend from claim 1, thereby eliminating any confusion with the recitation in claim 9.

With regard to the substantive rejections under 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a), Applicant traverses the rejections for the following reasons. Initially, Applicant notes that Office Action refers to “Figure 29-10” of Tamba as the basis of the rejection. Applicant assumes this is a typo, and should state Figures “9-10.” Clarification is respectfully requested. With regard to claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 14-15, Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to teach all of the claim limitations as is required under 35 USC 102(b). For instance, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “a voltage comparator (35) connected to an output (34) of the integrator,” wherein the integrator is part of the master control unit. In the structure disclosed by Tamba, the comparator 31 is connected to an output of the slave filter 20.

Claim 1 further recites a phase frequency comparator that generates “a control signal (v)” that is received by “the slave filter.” The Office Action alleges that EOR structure 33 teaches the phase frequency comparator. However, the EOR structure 33 of Tamba generates an input to OTA (transconductance amplifier-capacitor) 34, which has an output tied to a capacitor C. Accordingly, Tamba does not teach a phase frequency comparator that generates “a control signal (v)” that is received by “the slave filter.”

For these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 14-15 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 10, 12 and 13 are believed allowable for the same reasons, since the secondary reference Petersen et al. fails to remedy these deficiencies.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: 7/24/06

---

Michael F. Hoffman  
Reg. No. 40,019

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
75 State Street  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile